

REMARKS

Summary of Amendments

Claims 1-13, all of the pending claims, have been amended. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to follow agreements on amending the claim, reached with the Examiner in a telephone interview on May 16, 2006, as outlined in the accompanying Interview Summary Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b). Independent claims 7 and 13 have been amended to accord with the amendments to claim 1, while the dependent claims have been amended as necessitated by the amendments to their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 5; Maruyama et al. '271 in view of Branson '460

Claims 1-3, and 5 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,603,271 to Maruyama et al., in view of U.S. Pat. No. 1,313,460 to Branson.

Claim 4; Maruyama et al. '271 as modified by Branson '460, further in view of McAnally et al. '566

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruyama et al. as modified by Branson, referenced and discussed above, further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,788,566 to McAnally et al.

Claim 6; Maruyama et al. '271 as modified by Branson '460, further in view of Price '534

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruyama et al. as modified by Branson, referenced and discussed above, further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 3,481,534 to Price.

Claim 7-11 and 13; McAnally et al. '566 in view of Maruyama et al. '271, further in view of Branson '460

Claim 12; McAnally et al. '566 as modified by Maruyama et al. '271 as modified by Branson '460, and in view of Price '534

Claims 7-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAnally et al. in view of Maruyama et al., and further in view of Branson, each of which patents has been referenced and discussed above.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAnally et al. as modified by Maruyama et al. as modified by Branson, and in view of Price, each of which patents has been referenced and discussed above.

Reconsideration of the present application based on the claims as amended in the present paper, and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims, are respectfully requested in view of the telephone interview conducted on May 16, 2006 with the Examiner by Applicant's undersigned representative.

As set forth in the accompanying Interview Summary, to which reference is hereby made, the present amendments should distinguish the claims over the prior art of record.

As noted in the Interview Summary, the Examiner made allowability of the claim conditional on the inclusion of the recitation of the inclined side of the ribs. That inclusion has been made, as will be noted from the quotation below from claim 1.

a guard plate . . . composed of ribs each of which in transverse section has at least one side inclined at substantially the same angle as said airflow vector.

Further, the key passage from the guard-plate recitation in claim 1 as presented to the Examiner to discuss in the interview read as follows.

a guard plate . . . including a plurality of intersecting rib groups forming a . . . meshwork wherein each rib group intersects at least one other rib group in lines of intersection inclined at substantially the same angle as said airflow vector

{form in submission for telephone interview}.

Nevertheless, in the present amendment, in addition to adding the recitation as to the ribs having an inclined side, the above-quoted passage has been modified as follows.

a guard plate . . . composed of ribs . . . being arranged in a plurality of intersecting groups to form a meshwork in which each rib group intersects at least one other rib group in intersection lines inclined at substantially the same angle as said airflow vector

{form resulting from present amendment}.

It is respectfully submitted that this slight change over the language agreed to in the telephone interview amounts to creating an even more positive recitation of the special meshwork rib configuration that is a unique feature of the present invention, but does not depart from the intention of the agreed-upon amendment language.

App. No. 10/707,104
Preliminary Amendment dated June 8, 2006

Accordingly, Applicant courteously urges that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is requested. Favorable action by the Examiner at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

June 8, 2006

/James Judge/

James W. Judge
Registration No. 42,701

JUDGE & MURAKAMI IP ASSOCIATES
Dojima Building, 7th Floor
6-8 Nishitemma 2-Chome, Kita-ku
Osaka-shi 530-0047
JAPAN

Telephone: **305-938-7119**
Voicemail/Fax: **703-997-4565**